

10-5-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 5, 2010

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 5, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 55.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/55

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Professional Standards Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

PSC Meeting Minutes: October 5, 2010

Attendance:

- Members: Claire Strom, Dorothy Mays, Steven St. John, David Charles, Richard James, Marc Fetscherin, Emily Russell, Joshua Almond
- Dean of Faculty Representative: Interim Dean Deb Wellman

Meeting Convened: 7:33

Announcements:

- Approval of last week's minutes: Richard moved, David seconded. Minutes approved.
- CIEs
 - Team teaching: Concerning the Holt and A&S evaluation results, what averages should Holt be put against? Holt doesn't have online evaluations so they'll all be A&S. If there is a cross-listed class that we are being evaluated for, it should be compared to A&S data.
 - Steven - All the data is there from all the various sources. Why can't they just present all the data?
- Feedback to Administrators
 - Claire - Last year, PSC came up with a form and a protocol with the intention of launching this year.
 - Steven- Is it already in bylaws?
 - Deb - Yes but 2 yrs ago, when this came up, [there were issues].
 - Dorothy - But really, we'll only be evaluating the President. Laurie and Deb are so new.
 - Josh - Nonetheless, I think this might be a good time to provide feedback. Consider it a sort of litmus test.
 - Marc - How can we reasonably evaluate positions that have only been in place for two months?
 - Josh- Keep in mind, this isn't an evaluation but feedback
 - Claire - We planned for two biannual reviews: the President and the Dean of Students this year, and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty next year.
 - Marc - I will volunteer to draft up some questions for the feedback form.
 - Deb - I think we should start with a paragraph on the nature of the feedback. We want it to be civil and not negative.
 - Claire - I will make an appointment with Lewis and Karen to discuss potential questions and outline the process. If Marc drafts up some questions and Lewis and Karen draft some, then we'll hope to have a good working document.
 - Marc - The outlet is good. [speaking about the nature of feedback from a faculty perspective]
 - Deb - Yes, but negative feedback is destructive.

- Emily - This is the 3rd year talking about this. By the time we're done, it will be far enough removed from the controversy that started [this process].
 - Claire will meet with Lewis; Marc will wait on questions.
- Grants
 - Claire - Concerning the upcoming evaluation of grants: All grant applications are up on blackboard. We can all see them. We should begin reviewing the proposals in anticipation of our October 19 meeting.
 - If the faculty member has not filed their FSAR, then Karla won't put up the application. The bigger problems are midcourse and final reports. We'll talk about that later
 - Does anyone want to talk about how we evaluate? Last year, we looked to see if they were appropriate to the rules and if they filled out all the proper forms and provided a detailed budget.
 - Emily- I think we also considered the ambition of the grant.
 - Don penalty
 - Discussion around how much money we should allocate for the fall review (FYRST and Sabbatical grants) and how much we should leave for the spring.
 - Claire - We've got about \$80,000. Last year we did about 30% but the pool is bigger this year.
 - Deb - Normally, we do about 25-30% in the fall and the remainder in the spring.
 - Josh - Suggested 40% to help compensate for the larger pool.
 - Committee agreed on 40% which results around 30K for fall round.
 - Claire - One person did not submit their midcourse report and another didn't submit their final report. Do we consider their applications?
 - There followed a debate surrounding the issue:
 - Did we advertise these changes? Yes.
 - Is it on the forms? Has this been communicated to the applicants? Yes.
 - Perhaps we should be lenient this year but stress that we will not make such allowances in the future?
 - It was pointed out that a grant was denied last year for a similar reason.
 - Josh moved to call the question, Steven seconded. The question was called.
 - Josh moved to uphold PSC policy as stated on the grant application form, Dick seconded. Vote passed.
 - There follows continued discussion surrounding reports, communication, and the six-month penalty period.
 - Marc proposed that we need to be more flexible and that 6 months might be too long and penalize people twice (fall and spring), is not one time enough? He proposed that as

long as the report is provided before the new grant cycle starts should be an acceptable rule.

- o Claire - There are some double grant applications. Can individuals be eligible for more than one grant?
- o Deb - There is a cap of 5k per person.
- o Marc - Is that written down somewhere and has that been communicated to the applicants? If not, that cannot be considered a criteria.
- o Deb and Claire would investigate that issue.

Adjourn 8:32am